

Application No.: 10/008553

Docket No.: MWS-009

REMARKS

Claims 5, 9, 13, 18 and 24 have been amended. No claims have been cancelled. Claims 25-42 have been added. Thus claims 1-42 are presently pending in the application.

Specification Objection

Applicants respectfully traverse this objection. Support for the diagram types listed in claim 13 may be found at page 4, lines 9-13.

Claim 13 Objection

Applicants have corrected the typographical error noted by the Examiner of the word "kinematic" in the amended claim 13 listed above.

Claim Rejection Pursuant of 35 U.S.C §112

Claim 24 has been amended to clarify the antecedent basis issue noted by the Examiner. Applicants have noted that it is the "single electronic diagram" that is stored in the configuration management system.

Indications of Allowability

Applicants appreciate the indication of allowability of claims 5-7, 9, 10, 17, 19 and 22. The claims were rejected as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but were indicated to be allowable if re-written in independent form incorporating all of the elements of the underlying claims upon which they were dependent. Accordingly, Applicants have amended claim 5 (upon which claims 6-7 are dependent), and claim 9 (upon which claim 10 is dependent) to incorporate the elements of the underlying claim 1. Following the amendments, Applicants believe claims 5-7 and 9-10 to be in condition for allowance. While Applicants appreciate the indication of allowability of claims 17, 19 and 22, Applicants have not amended those claims as Applicants believe the claims are already in condition for allowance for the reasons set forth below.

Docket No.: MWS-009

Application No.: 10/008553

Rejections pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-4, 13-16, 18, 20, 23 and 24 were rejected as being anticipated by Schatz et al., (U.S. Patent No. 5, 845, 270, hereafter Schatz et al). In light of the amendments above and for the reasons set forth below, these rejections are respectfully traversed.

Summary of Claimed Invention

The claimed invention provides a method of reconciling and merging two displayed electronic diagrams into one electronic diagram. After differences between corresponding areas of the two electronic diagrams are detected, the claimed invention provides a mechanism for merging different features of a first diagram into a second diagram. The second diagram may receive and merge all of the differences identified from the first diagram, or only selected differences. Distinctions are made between graphical and functional feature differences in the two diagrams. The claimed invention enables the user to specify which type of feature differences should be merged (i.e., graphical differences, functional differences, both graphical and functional differences, or individually selected differences regardless of the classification).

Summary of Schatz et al

Schatz describes a system for modeling resource flows through systems. Systems and the resources flowing through the systems are modeled so as to determine associations between the systems and to organize information about the systems. The system objects, resource objects and the relationships between the system objects and resource objects may be used to create a network diagram so as to allow a graphical analysis of the relationships. Schatz also discusses a method of interconnecting two or more network diagrams to form a single merged network diagram.

Claim 1 includes the steps of determining corresponding features of components that are present in both diagrams, determining the differences between the diagrams and merging the differences from one diagram into the other at a corresponding location in the other diagram. Schatz et al does not follow this process but rather analyzes components and their connections in order to determine how to merge the network diagrams. The method of merging diagrams in

Application No.: 10/008553

Docket No.: MWS-009

Schatz et al is specifically limited to the situation where the network diagrams include only direct resource flow lines that do not bypass intermediary systems (See Column 11, lines 3-4). The reason for this limitation is that the merger process of Schatz et al compares the taxonomies (tree-like data structures) of system components underlying the network diagrams without regard for the system component features per se. The focus in Schatz et al is on resource flows through systems, thus explaining the requirement of the direct connection between system components. Schatz et al merges diagrams based on components and component connections rather than identified component feature differences as in the claimed invention. Schatz et al thus fails to disclose, teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 1 (upon which claims 2-4 and 13-14) and the corresponding medium claim 20 (upon which claims 21- 24 are dependent). Accordingly, Applicants suggest that claims 1-4, 13-14, and 20- 24 are now in condition for allowance.

Claim 15 discusses the merging of two state diagrams characterized by lines representing transitions between states, the transitions taking effect upon the occurrence of a specified event. Claim 15 includes the determining of corresponding features and the determining of differences with the differences being recorded as data elements. Merging of the state diagrams is based on the determined differences in the state features. As discussed above, Schatz et al does not focus on the component attributes(and data) but rather merges based on components and component connections. Accordingly, Schatz et al does not disclose, teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 15, and Applicants therefore respectfully suggest that claims 15-17 are now in condition for allowance.

Applicants have amended independent claim 18 (upon which indicated-as-allowable claim 19 is dependent) to include the additional limitation that the electronic diagrams being merged include at least one semantic connection which associates components in the electronic diagram without a direct connection in the diagram. As noted above, Schatz et al requires a direct connection between the components in the electronic diagrams in order to perform the merge process. Schatz et al thus fails to disclose, teach or suggest all of the elements of claim 18. Applicants respectfully suggest claims 18 and 19 are therefore now in condition for allowance.

Application No.: 10/008553

Docket No.: MWS-009

Rejections pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 8, 11 and 12 were rejected as being obvious over Schatz et al, in view of Hsu (United States Patent No. 5, 845, 270, hereafter Hsu). Claims 8, 11 and 12 all depend directly or indirectly upon claim 1. As previously discussed above, the merge process of Schatz et al does not function in the same manner as the claimed invention and Schatz et al thus failed to disclose all of the elements of the underlying claim. Since Hsu (which is cited to provide a highlighting limitation) does not provide the missing limitations of the merge steps of claim 1 previously discussed, the combination of Schatz et al and Hsu does not render claims 8, 11 and 12 obvious and Applicants submit that those claims are now also in condition for allowance.

Summary of Newly Added Claims

Applicants have added two additional sets of claims, method claims 25-33 and corresponding medium claims 34-42. Independent claim 25 is the same as claim 1 with the additional limitation that that the electronic diagrams being merged include at least one semantic connection which associates components in the electronic diagram without a direct connection in the diagram. For the reasons set forth in the discussion of claim 18 above, Applicants submit that claims 25-42 are in condition for allowance.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims 1- 42 in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

Application No.: 10/008553

Docket No.: MWS-009

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 12-0080, under Order No. MWS-009 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: February 5, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By John S. Curran
John S. Curran
Registration No.: 50,445
LAHIVE & COCKFIELD, LLP
28 State Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02109
(617) 227-7400
(617) 742-4214 (Fax)
Attorney/Agent For Applicant